BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,071	01/02/2001	Edward D. English	1517.1008-002	3494

21005 7590 07/06/2004

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER	
HENEGHAN, MATTHEW E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/753,071	ENGLISH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew Heneghan	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 January 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-55* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20,22-55* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *21* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 January 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/22/01*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-55 have been examined.

Priority

2. The instant application has been filed as a continuation-in-part to U.S. Patent Application No. 09/595,152, filed 16 June 2000, which claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/139,986, filed 18 June 1999.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The following Information Disclosure Statement in the instant application has been fully considered:

IDS filed 22 August 2001.

Specification

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and

compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:
(1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
(2) if an article, its method of making;
(3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
(4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
(5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

The abstract should describe in greater detail how the disclosed invention works, rather than simply describing its utility.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology

Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-5, 31-35, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,938,767 to Horn.

As per claim 1, 31, and 55, a key is turned in a lock, causing a relay to be set that enables or disables data flow (see abstract; column 5, lines 47-51; and column 6, lines 57-60). It is usable with network cards as well as modems (see column 3, lines 28-30).

As per claim 2, the state of the lock is checked before sending data (see column 5, lines 52-67).

As per claims 3, 4, 33, and 34, the system is used to regulate access to wide-area networks, such as the Internet (see column 3, lines 49-51).

As per claim 5, 32, and 35, a set of rules is used on the data to differentiate allowable from disallowed data flows (see column 6, lines 11-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 5-16, 18-20, 24-26, 29-31, and 35-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,635 to Reardon in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,938,767 to Horn.

Regarding claims 1 and 31, the invention of Reardon restricts data flow (see abstract) and is usable by parents for their children (see column 13, lines 31-40), but does not use a lock and key.

Horn uses a lock and key, as described above, and Horn further suggests that this lockout system gives an adult the ability to restrict Internet access without knowing how to use a computer (see column 3, lines 35-40).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Reardon by adding a lock and key, as disclosed by Horn, to give an adult the ability to restrict Internet access without knowing how to use a computer.

Regarding claims 5-10, 35-40, Reardon discloses the regulation of communications across networks, and the use, inherently stored in memory, of a list of authorized Internet sites via web browsers, retrieving web pages (see column 21, line 59 to column 22, line 10). Internet sites are either referenced by the URL or the IP address of a server, depending on the target site.

As per claims 11-16, 18-20, 24-26, 29, 30, 41-54, the invention as modified requires a user to enter a PIN (password) after inserting the token/key (see Reardon, column 12, lines 20-23).

7. Claims 17, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,635 to Reardon in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,938,767 to Horn as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,212,558 to Antur et al.

Reardon and Horn do not disclose the screening of traffic based on the data source or time of day.

Antur discloses firewall security policies wherein restrictions may be made according to time of day or the source of the communication, and further suggests that these define acceptable uses of applications and acceptable access to information (see column 5, lines 27-46).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Reardon and Horn by implementing security policies restricting according to time of day or the source of the communication, as disclosed by Antur, as these define acceptable uses of applications and acceptable access to information.

8. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,635 to Reardon in view of U.S. Patent

No. 5,938,767 to Horn as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,025 to Baehr et al.

Reardon and Horn do not disclose the screening of email traffic according to author and recipient.

Baehr discloses the filtering of traffic according to its source and destination (see abstract) and discloses that this can be applied to email (see column 6, line 28), and further suggests that a firewall should be designed to minimize the number of ways in which it can be targeted (see column 1, lines 50-53).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Reardon and Horn by filtering email by source and destination, as disclosed by Baehr, as a firewall should be designed to minimize the number of ways in which it can be targeted.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claim 21 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 21, though firewalls can be configured to restrict multiple types of sessions (see Antur, column 9), no art could be found wherein the policy configuration for session types was directly mapped to the key position, above and beyond the general enablement of the system.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,894,551 to Huggins et al. discloses a system for mechanically controlling access between two networks.

U.S. Patent No. 6,249,868 to Sherman et al. discloses a system for using tokens to regulate PC access.

U.S. Patent No. 6,308,204 to Nathan et al. discloses a network-based jukebox with a lock.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0007459 to Cassista et al. discloses a mechanical lock for restricting network accesses.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0023232 to Serani et al. discloses a global communication network with access restricted by a lock.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Heneghan, whose telephone

number is (703) 305-7727. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, or Friday from 7:30 AM - 4:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse, can be reached on (703) 308-4789.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Or faxed to:
(703) 872-9306
Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 2, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

MEH

June 28, 2004

GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100